


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AMARILLO DIVISION



KENNETH LEE LINCICOME, II,

Petitioner,

v.

Director, TDCJ-CID,

Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

2:19-CV-076-Z-BR

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND  
DISMISSING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

Before the Court are the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge to dismiss the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus filed by Petitioner in this case. ECF No. 31. On September 14, 2021, Petitioner filed objections to the findings, conclusions and recommendation. ECF No. 32. After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, the Court concludes that the findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are correct. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are **ADOPTED**, and the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED**. Petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**.

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court denies a certificate of appealability because Petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see also Hernandez v. Thaler*, 630 F.3d 420, 424 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2011). The Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's findings, conclusions, and

recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that Petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484.

If Petitioner files a notice of appeal, he must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.

This order also terminates Petitioner's motion to "calendar" this case (ECF No. 30).

**SO ORDERED.**

September 21, 2021.



---

MATTHEW J. KACSMARYK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE